

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

*New replacement formal Figures 3 and 4 are submitted concurrently herewith under a separate cover letter.*

### **REMARKS**

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the objections and rejections set forth in the Office Action of May 2, 2006 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner objected to the drawings due to various informalities. In particular, the Examiner asserted that the original drawings did not adequately illustrate the features recited in the method claims. In order to address these objections, new Figures 3 and 4, each comprising a flowchart illustrating the various features of the method recited in one or more of the claims, have been prepared and submitted herewith. Because all of the subject matter illustrated in these new figures was clearly set forth in the original disclosure, it is submitted that no new matter has been added. Furthermore, in view of the submission of these new figures, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's objections to the drawings have been overcome.

The Examiner objected to the specification due to various informalities. In particular, the Examiner asserted that the abstract is in improper form, and that the specification contains various editorial errors. In order to address these objections and make additional editorial corrections, the entire specification and abstract have been reviewed and revised. In particular, the legal terminology in the abstract has been replaced, the required section headings have been inserted into the specification, and the reference to the claims has been removed. As the revisions are quite extensive, the amendments to the specification and abstract have been incorporated into the attached substitute specification and abstract. For the Examiner's benefit, a marked-up copy of the specification indicating the changes made thereto is also enclosed. No new matter has been added by the revisions. Entry of the substitute specification is thus requested. In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's objections to the specification and abstract have been overcome.

On pages 4-6 of the Office Action, the Examiner has set forth various objections and formal rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 of the original claims. However, as indicated above, the original claims have now been cancelled and replaced with new claims 25-36. These new claims have been drafted merely to place the original claims in a proper form according to US practice, thereby addressing the Examiner's formal objections and rejections, and no attempt has been

made to modify the scope of the original claims. As a result, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's formal objections and formal rejections under § 112 are not applicable to the new claims.

In items 9 and 10 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that the original claims contain allowable subject matter, and would be allowable if amended to address the formal objections and formal rejections discussed above. In view of this indication of allowable subject matter, and the fact that the new claims have been drafted to correspond to the original claims as explained above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 25-36 are now in condition for allowance.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner should have any comments or suggestions to help speed the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,

Harald GOMM

By: 

W. Douglas Hahm  
Registration No. 44,142  
Attorney for Applicant

WDH/ck  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
August 2, 2006